APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,293	06/30/2004	Deborra J. Zukowski	F-822-O1	4292

919   7590   05/02/2007

PITNEY BOWES INC.
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3000
MSC 26-22
SHELTON, CT 06484-8000

EXAMINER
ULRICH, NICHOLAS S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/710,293	ZUKOWSKI ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas S. Ulrich	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 June 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-17 are pending.

Priority

2.   The claims for priority to provisional application 60/521747 is incorrect due to the
applicant claiming priority to 6/06/2004. The filing date of provisional application
60/521747 is 6/29/2004 and should be reflected as such in the claim for priority.
Correction is required.

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: The last line should
read "**the** notification manager". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

.The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claim 1 recites the limitation "the needed inputs". There is insufficient
antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5.   Claim 7 recites the limitations "the URI" and "the description". There is
insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

6.   Claim 9 recites the limitation "the initiator" and "the initial message". There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Watts et al. (US 6119186) in view of Cheung et al. (US 2004/0061716 A1).

In regard to **claim 1**, Watts discloses a method for processing a change of state

in a responsive environment comprising:

determining a type of response that the environment should provide in response

to the change of state *(Fig 5b element 86c and Column 10 lines 15-16: Configuration is*

determined based on location change sensed by a sensor);

defining response descriptions for the needed response instance in an

application model *(Fig 5b elements 86c-86e and Column 10 lines 15-16: When looking*

up default configurations in order to provide the change in configuration to the end user,

it is inherent that the response is defined based on the necessary parameters needed to

convert to the changed configuration);

storing the needed inputs in the response description *(Fig 5b elements 86c-86e*

and Column 8 lines 41-42: Based on the determined response and necessary

descriptions for that response, It is inherent that during lookup of the default

configuration for the sensed event, that any necessary inputs will also be retrieved that

were stored in the database that defines the configuration change);

creating a new notification *(Fig 5b element 86d: it is inherent that a new*

notification is created to prompt the user of the change in configuration);

defining a new notification description in a notification model *(Fig 5b and Column*

10 lines 22-27: when prompting the user, It is inherent that prompt is defined prior to

presenting to the user in order to provide descriptive material of what is about to occur

to the configuration) ;

associating the response descriptions within the new notification description *(Fig*

5b and Column 10 lines 22-27: in order for the user to accept a configuration change, it

is inherent that the defined response is included in the prompt);

Watts does not explicitly disclose providing the new notification to a notification

manager. Watts does discuss delivering the notification to a user but does not disclose

using a notification manager to deliver notifications to the user.

However, Cheung discloses providing the new notification to a notification

manager *(Paragraph 0027 lines 1-3).*   At the time of invention, it would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Cheung to Watts invention

because one would be motivated to provide a notification manager in order to allow

notifications to be viewed and managed by a user as desired. *(See Cheung paragraph*

0004 lines 4-5).

In regard to **claim 2**, Watts discloses the response comprises launching an

application *(Column 12 lines 60-67).*

In regard to **claim 3**, Watts discloses the response comprises effecting a further

change of state *(Column 9 lines 48-52: As best understood, the response could require*

waiting for or receiving information from another source before changing state or

environment, therefore the first response effects a further change in state when multiple

events need to occur for stimulating a state change).

In regard to **claim 4**, Watts discloses the response comprises launching an

application and effecting a further change of state *(Column 9 lines 48-65).*

In regard to **claim 5**, Watts discloses determining if the response includes an

immediate response event and if the response includes an immediate response event,

initiating the immediate response event before providing the new notification to a

notification manager *(Column 11 lines 60-63 and Fig 8 element 118 and 120: once*

detected use in an airplane, before a prompt is sent to the user, unnecessary systems

and software are disabled).

In regard to **claim 6,** Watts discloses the response comprises launching an application and the immediate response event comprises effecting a further change of state *(Column 11 lines 60-66).*

In regard to **claim 7**, Watts discloses a method for processing a response notification selection from a user in a responsive environment comprising:

and accessing the description for a notification object corresponding to the selection from a notification model *(Column 12 lines 54-55: In order to provide the notification to the user, it is inherent that a description of the response to be made is incorporated into the prompt to the user)*

retrieving the URI for a corresponding application *(Column 12 lines 49-67: Although Watts does not explicitly disclose using a URI, it is just one possibility for locating a program within the autolaunch list. The application must be identified someway, so it is inherent that some form of tag or indicator is used)*;

retrieving the description of the application *(Column 12 lines 52-54: The autolaunch list has descriptions of application)*;

displaying information about the notification and application parameters to the user *(Column 12 lines 54-55)*;

and querying the user to allow the user the opportunity to accept or reject the notification *(Column 12 lines 54-55).*

Watts fails to disclose reporting to the responsive environment that the user has selected the response notification.

However, Cheung discloses user has selected the response notification *(Paragraph 0032 lines 3-4).)*.   At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Cheung to Watts invention because one would be motivated to provide a notification manager in order to allow notifications to be viewed and managed by a user as desired. *(See Cheung paragraph 0004 lines 4-5)*.

In regard to **claim 8**, Watts discloses changing the environment context in response to the selection *(Column 10 lines 22-27)*.

In regard to **claim 9**, Watts discloses changing the environment context in response to the selection comprises notifying the initiator of the initial message *(Column 10 lines 1-30)*

In regard to **claim 10**, Watts discloses terminating processing of the response notification if the user rejects the response notification *(Fig 5b and Column 10 lines 24-25: if declined, no state change is made and resumes with Home configuration. There is no discussion of an attempt to try again at a later time)*

In regard to **claim 11**, Watts discloses terminating processing comprises terminating an application *(Fig 8 element 118: Disable software)*.

In regard to **claim 12**, Watts discloses querying the user to allow the user the opportunity to explicitly accept the notification *(Column 10 lines 25-27)*.

In regard to **claim 13**, Watts discloses if the notification is accepted, launching the application using the application parameters *(Column12 lines 54-55)*.

In regard to **claims 14, 15, and 16**, Watts discloses querying the user to allow the user the opportunity to accept the notification and to provide input to change the application parameters, creating new application parameters, and using new application parameters when launching application *(Column 6 lines 22-28)*.

In regard to **claim 17**, System claim 17 corresponds generally to method claim 1, respectively, and recites similar features in system form, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nicholas S. Ulrich whose telephone number is 571-270-

1397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Ulrich
4/23/2007
2173

/TADESSE HAILU

Patent Examiner